ED 156 002 BRIEF TO THE ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS. GRADUATE PLANNING IN ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES.

1 OF 1 ONTARIO COUNCIL ON GRADUATE STUDIES, TORONTO.

78 39P.

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 002 HE 010 108

TITLE	Brief to the Ontario Council on University Affairs. Graduate Planning in Ontario Universities.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, Toronto.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	39p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, Council of Ontario Universities, Suite 8039, 130 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2T4
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classification; *Cooperative Programs; *Financial Support; *Foreign Countries; *Graduate Study; *Planning; Program Development; Program Planning; *Scholarships; Statewide Planning; Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS	*Ontario

ABSTRACT

Explained briefly are the objectives for the first quinquennium (1979-80 to 1983-84), the planning process, funding new graduate programs, classifying new programs for funding, funding mechanisms, cooperative activities in graduate studies, and the Ontario graduate scholarship program. (HSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156002

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Council of Ontario Universities

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
THE OBJECTIVES FOR THE FIRST QUINQUENNIUM	1
THE PLANNING PROCESS	3
FUNDING NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMMES	6
CLASSIFYING "NEW PROGRAMMES" FOR FUNDING	10
FUNDING MECHANISMS	13
COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES IN GRADUATE STUDIES	15
THE ONTARIO GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME	17
SUMMARY	22

APPENDIX I The Characterization of Unfunded Graduate Programmes

APPENDIX II Collaborative Graduate Programmes

This brief on graduate planning in Ontario universities in the period of the first quinquennium, 1979-80 to 1983-84, is mainly a response to OCUA Advisory Memorandum 77-VII. When the Memorandum was issued, the universities were invited to reply to it during the Spring 1978 round of hearings. The Council of Ontario Universities and its affiliate, the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies are pleased to do so by the presentation of this brief.

THE OBJECTIVES FOR THE FIRST QUINQUENNIUM

The objectives for the first quinquennium outlined in Advisory Memorandum 77-VII resemble very closely those developed earlier in Advisory Memorandum 76-IV and generally supported by COU/OCGS in the June 1977 brief to OCUA. We accept that the dominant theme for graduate planning during the five-year period, 1979-80 to 1983-84, should be consolidation; and we agree on the basic appropriateness of the objectives specified by Council for this period in which graduate enrolment, particularly at the doctoral level, is expected to continue to decline.

We wish to emphasize, however, that we regard academic quality as the primordial objective of the graduate planning exercise

in this or any other period, and we see as the most fundamental objective the provision of high quality graduate programmes. The other more specific objectives are to be seen in this light. For this reason we are very concerned that the predicted period of strictly contained provincial funding will render impossible the attainment of the stated specific objectives.

As we examine the six stated objectives we see two of them being used as means to attain the remaining four. Given the expected severe financial constraints, it follows that the elimination of programmes of unsatisfactory quality and of programmes involving unnecessary duplication are legitimate objectives. For when resources are severely limited we should not allow the resources required for the maintenance of existing programmes of high quality and for the introduction of needed new programmes of high quality to be sapped in order to preserve what is less desirable. Therefore we expect that these two objectives will be rigorously applied.

We are concerned, however, that the OCUA statement of objectives tends to give too much emphasis to consolidation and insufficient attention to the maintenance of a dynamic graduate enterprise. Were we to undertake a restatement of these objectives in descending order of importance, we would enumerate them in the following three groups of two. In first place would be the encouragement

of a dynamic graduate enterprise, involving instruction, scholarship and research activity by the universities independent of growth in enrolment. Included in this would be encouragement for new graduate programmes of high quality as needed either in terms of intellectual value or in terms of social need. Next would come the recognition and protection of existing outstanding doctoral programmes and the support of high quality graduate programmes at all levels. And finally would be the elimination of unsatisfactory programmes and the prevention of further duplication.

While we accept that consolidation will be the dominant theme in graduate planning during the first quinquennium, we do not consider that consolidation alone will maintain adequately the quality of the enterprise, and we wish to direct attention to the need for innovation.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

COU/OCGS has always held the view that graduate planning in this Province should be grounded in the universities, taken singly and collectively. Therefore we are pleased to note that Council has concluded, after review, that the values of institutional autonomy outweigh the benefits that might be ascribed to a strengthening of

the central planning process through a change in structures. Yet when resources are becoming more limited, we recognize the need for increased attention to planning, including greater attention to the implications for the provincial graduate enterprise of the plans of individual institutions. We insist that academic planning must begin with the institutions, but we also recognize that a balanced set of high quality graduate programmes which maximize the use of scarce resources is not necessarily the result of the sum total of individual institution's ambitions, plans and capabilities.

The present planning structure is based on the discipline assessment/appraisals process. We support the continuation of this process in the first quinquennium, with a more selective and rigorous pursuit of the discipline assessments and greater attention to quality control in the appraisals process under the new OCGS by-laws. But we note limitations inherent in this approach to graduate planning that might assume a larger significance in this period when resources are expected to be very limited. In the past, when an appraisal has resulted in a negative judgment on quality, the tendency has been for the institution to commit further resources in order to strengthen the programme. When resources are scarce, this might not be possible or desirable, either for the institution or for the collectivity. Even if the institution had the resources, institutional self-denial

might be preferable for the good of the collectivity. So too with the discipline assessments. These involve one discipline at a time and take little explicit account of how various disciplines relate to one another either in given institutions or in the collectivity. As resources grow scarcer and more difficult decisions are required on how best to husband these resources, we may need to develop some mechanism that encourages individual institutions to make more decisions involving self-denial and an internal re-allocation of their academic programme priorities. In the present system there are few incentives to do this.

Also, with respect to the nature of the planning and appraisals process, we note that it is a process employing a complex system of peer evaluation, and as a consequence is lengthy and time-consuming. It would be unrealistic, therefore, to expect that a large number of assessments could be completed under the new procedures in any given five-year period. The success of the appraisals/assessment process, including the quality of the judgments made and their acceptance by the universities and by the collectivity, is linked to the fact that this work is done by academics of stature, respected in their disciplines and in the university community at large. Most academics of this stature are unwilling to undertake this type of work on a full-time basis. Therefore, we do not favour having members of ACAP and of the Appraisals Committee appointed on a

full-time basis, even for a short term. But, in order to expedite the process, we are requesting universities to agree to release faculty on a part-time basis (by giving them a reduced load) in order to shorten somewhat the time required for the planning/appraisals process.

Concerning the purposes, format and content of future annual reports on graduate studies, we welcome the suggestion that a meeting be held of representatives of OCUA, COU and MCU in order to work out improvements.

FUNDING NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMMES

Advisory Memorandum 77-VII proposes four criteria to be used in determining whether new programmes shall receive funding. In developing these criteria Council has stated its conviction that, because of anticipated constrained global funding and declining enrolment during the first quinquennium, new graduate programmes cannot be expected to generate additional funding for the system. And because it wishes to protect existing programmes of good or outstanding quality while making room for needed new ones, OCUA has outlined explicit criteria of need and novelty as well as the criterion that the programmes shall have met a rigorous appraisal of quality.

Evidence of need, the first criterion, presents considerable difficulties. Council has acknowledged the complexity of the task of establishing "need" by declining to produce a specific definition of the grounds for substantiating it. It does, however, cite two types of relevant evidence: external demand and student demand. To be sure, both are relevant; but each presents real problems. External need is often measured by manpower forecasts and by the availability of employment opportunities. But these are notoriously unreliable measures when applied to graduate programmes that require long lead-time in planning and development. Moreover, these kinds of criteria are much more relevant to some academic programmes than in others. Student demand is also difficult to measure. Enrolment patterns in similar programmes in other jurisdictions and student applications can yield some relevant information. But often student demand can only be accurately assessed after a programme has been in operation for a number of years. And there is no way we can ascertain the number of students leaving Ontario for similar programmes in other jurisdictions, or assess the variety of reasons for their so doing. Finally, it must be recognized that student demand is not equivalent to need. There can be instances in which high demand for a particular programme does not imply that there is need for the development of such a programme. While an essential condition of need, student demand by itself is not a sufficient condition.

COU, which through ACAP is to be given the responsibility for applying this criterion, will have a difficult task and require some discretion in the fulfilment of it.

The second criterion, involving a judgment on duplication, will also require difficult decisions. It may be expected that most proposed new programmes will not be completely different from some existing ones. Therefore, the decision will have to be made on the basis of whether the proposed new programme is sufficiently novel to warrant the judgment that no similar programme is available in the Province. Also, on rare occasions there may be a judgment that a proposed new programme is significantly better in quality than one or more of the existing programmes in the same field. It should be made clear that ACAP will have the responsibility to exercise discretion in this case. For otherwise a new programme that is judged superior in quality to existing ones in the same field will go unfunded.

The third criterion gives COU/ACAP responsibility for judging the academic quality of a programme through rigorous appraisal. The formal responsibility rests with COU but its judgment is based on recommendations from ACAP and OCGS. In the Memorandum OCUA states a second requirement, that at the time of the appraisal the programme was found not to require improvements. It is important here

to make a distinction between recommendations from an appraisal that are necessary to bring the programme up to minimum acceptable standards and recommendations intended to strengthen further a programme that has met minimum acceptable standards. If the appraisals process results in a judgment that the programme fails to meet the required standards of quality, then there should be no question of its being approved for funding. (The university is of course free to mount the programme without funding or withdraw it for strengthening and then resubmit it to appraisal.) It sometimes happens, however, that an Appraisals Committee will judge a programme as worthy of approval and at the same time recommend ways of further strengthening it. Meeting these suggestions for further improvement ought not to be a reason for denying funding approval.

Criterion four poses a different sort of problem. In the view of COU/OCGS it is unnecessary and should be eliminated. If universities are to be expected to develop new graduate programmes in order to meet new needs, and if they are to be required to meet strict criteria of assessment and appraisal, then it seems unnecessary to require them to admit students to the programme prior to its being considered for funding approval. This will only add another barrier to new programme development. By the time the programme has been assessed and appraised, the university will already have made significant resource commitments. Should the programme fail to attract students, there will be no income

generated by it and no cost to the remainder of the system.

Of far greater concern, however, is the position of OCUA that meeting these four criteria will not result in a recommendation for funding approval but will only guarantee consideration by Council and that a positive funding recommendation will not follow automatically. This appears to negate the whole thrust of the Advisory Memorandum and to be inconsistent with Council's basic position that the responsibility for planning should rest with the individual institutions and the collectivity. It also implies that Council has some additional criteria that it may wish to apply at the very end of the process. If this is so, these criteria should be specified now. In a period that combines consolidation of graduate planning and financial constraint the universities should be willing to be bound by strict criteria for funding. But they should know clearly what criteria they can be expected to meet.

CLASSIFYING "NEW PROGRAMMES" FOR FUNDING

During the period in which funding for graduate programmes has been frozen, a number of programmes have completed the planning/appraisals process and have been implemented. Others have been proceeding through these processes and will be ready for implementation in the

first quinquennium. In order to deal with these as yet unfunded programmes, Council proposes classifying them into three categories for funding consideration. We are suggesting some amendments to the categories as stated in Advisory Memorandum 77-VII. Our proposals are as follows:

Category 1: Any programme for which the former requirements for funding approval were completed prior to the effective date of the implementation of the freeze, May 1, 1976.

Programmes in this category would be exempt from the new funding criteria.

Category 2: Any programme which had not completed the requirements for funding approval prior to May 1, 1976 but which had received COU planning approval and had been submitted for appraisal prior to the date on which the Minister announced his acceptance of Advisory Memorandum 77-VII, March 21, 1978.

Programmes in this category have been carefully considered and examined by ACAP in the light of the earlier stated objectives of the first quinquennium outlined in Advisory Memorandum 76-IV, which are substantially the same as those stated in 77-VII, and have been recommended for approval on this basis. OCGS and COU have accepted the recommendations on this basis as well. Therefore, we see no need to review again these programmes, many of which have been in the planning process now for several years. A favourable appraisal, already obtained by most of these programmes, would complete the funding requirements for this category.

Category 3: Any new programme, including those which had received COU planning approval prior to March 21, 1978 but which had not been submitted for appraisal prior to that date.

These programmes would not be considered by OCUA for funding until the new criteria had been met.

The amendments take into account the intentions of OCUA. They also deal explicitly with how the lifting of the embargo relates to funding. Prior to the introduction of the funding freeze, the formal

lifting of the embargo was clearly the final step in the funding approval process. Since the freeze this step ceased to have any meaning and has not been treated as part of the normal approval process. The description of Category 2 has been developed on this basis.

The application of these proposed categories to the currently unfunded programmes is provided in tabular form in Appendix 1. In order to show the implications of various alternatives, both Category 1 and Category 2 have been sub-divided. The division within Category 1, between 1a and 1b, is based on whether the date of the freeze is taken to be the date of the Minister's letter announcing it (December 12, 1975) or the date of its formal imposition (May 1, 1976). Three programmes, those in Category 1b, are involved. The division within 2, between 2a and 2b, is based on whether the submission of a programme for appraisal or the completion of a favourable appraisal is judged to be the operative requirement that must have been fulfilled by March 21, 1978. Sixteen programmes, those in 2b, are affected.

FUNDING MECHANISMS

COU/OCGS agrees with OCUA on the set of objectives to be achieved by a funding mechanism, all within the general objectives of graduate

planning for the first quinquennium. We accept the desirability of identifying a base period and a discount for growth beyond that period as twin aspects of the funding mechanism. Further, we support OCUA's proposals that the formula currently in use for the funding of undergraduate programmes be employed for master's and graduate diploma programmes beginning with the funding year, 1979-80. We recommend, therefore, that the base for these programmes be established as the three-year period, 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78, and that enrolment changes between this fixed base and the moving three-year average be discounted at a rate of 50%.

For doctoral programmes we likewise support a funding mechanism developed on a base enrolment and a moving average, with a discount factor of 2/3, as proposed by OCUA. However, instead of a three-year base period, we recommend that the base period be five years, and cover the period 1973-74 to 1977-78. We entirely agree with the need to build in a high level of stability in doctoral funding in order to protect funding for research and scholarship. With declining doctoral enrolment, we think that establishing a five-year enrolment base will add a further element of stability and will, as well, reflect the fact that students are enrolled in doctoral programmes for a longer period of time.

Having stated these views on graduate funding mechanisms, we would

like to introduce as a possibility to be explored the development of some incentives to encourage institutions to reorganize their graduate planning. This is in line with our earlier comments on the need to maintain a dynamic graduate enterprise in a period of consolidation and financial restraint. Under the proposed funding mechanism institutions have considerable incentive to maintain existing graduate programmes, even when they might prefer to withdraw some and to substitute others judged preferable in terms of system needs or institutional priorities. For whatever is eliminated results in lost revenue and proposed new programmes must compete with other new programmes proposed by other institutions and may not result in revenue gains.

COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES IN GRADUATE STUDIES

Cooperation among faculties and departments of Ontario universities in graduate studies has always existed. In recent years the trend towards cooperation has increased and this is expected to continue. Two areas of cooperative activity in the graduate area deserve particular attention: collaborative graduate programmes, and the activities of the smaller universities to identify problems and develop cooperative methods of overcoming their particular disadvantages in this field.

It is accepted that the first quinquennium will be a period of consolidation and constraint. However, the universities do have a continuing responsibility to respond to changing circumstances. New specializations and new combinations of knowledge may be required to meet new and different issues confronting society and the universities. The need to maximize the use of scarce resources and make them more broadly available is likely to increase. COU/OCGS has already approved one useful means of meeting these kinds of issues by setting down conditions for the establishment of collaborative programmes. (See Appendix 2)

A collaborative programme is a device whereby the strengths of two or more existing programmes can be assembled to provide a consolidated programme of studies that could not be offered in any one of the programmes taken alone. Such programmes are not properly new programmes, since each student must register in one of the already existing programmes and complete all of the requirements for it. It may be expected that new collaborative programmes will be advertized and reported on as they develop, but there will be no additional funding provided for them. At the same time, since these are not new programmes, the new funding criteria will not apply to them.

The smaller universities have a modest but nonetheless real role to play in the Ontario graduate system. In some cases this is related to their regional responsibilities, in other cases to their particular areas of academic strength, and of course it may be related to both. In the present climate of restraint it is clear that a steady growth in graduate work across all disciplines and in all institutions cannot take place. Less graduate work is undertaken in the smaller institutions, but it is important nonetheless that their place in the graduate enterprise be recognized and stabilized. Moreover, as OCUA has recognized, they should be allowed the flexibility they need to respond adequately to regional needs and potential, especially in the area of programmes at the master's level designed for part-time students. The collectivity has need of their resources and expertise in graduate study and research and should give adequate attention to assisting them to resolve the problems related to geographical isolation and small size through the development of improved systems of cooperative activity in both academic programming and research.

THE ONTARIO GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME

The comments and recommendations in this section of the brief are based on extended discussion by OCGS of a report presented by the

Committee on Graduate Student Support, an analysis of application and award data for 1976-77 and 1977-78 and correspondence with the Chairman of the Selection Board. They are assembled under six main headings.

1. The Number of Awards

COU/OCGS warmly endorses the Minister's decision to increase the number of awards from 950 to 1200 for 1978-79. Nevertheless, we wish to point out that even if 1200 awards had been made in 1977-78, between 24 and 31 percent of the eligible applicants would not have received offers. Accordingly, we recommend that highest priority be given to increasing the number of awards still further but that, in any event, the number not be permitted to fall below 1200 in the future.

2. The Value of the Awards

Here too, we are appreciative of the emphasis placed on the value of the awards by OCUA in its Advisory Memorandum 77-I. In view of the rising costs of living and education and of the continuing need to support students of high quality in the graduate programmes of the Province, it is unfortunate that the

Minister was unable to support the recommendation in the Memorandum. We recommend that there should be an annual adjustment of the value of the Ontario Graduate Scholarship, and that the value for 1979-80 be increased to $4800 ($1600 per term).

3. Landed Immigrants and Visa Students

COU/OCGS wishes to reaffirm the desirability of ensuring that a reasonable number of academically strong visa students enrol in the graduate programmes of Ontario universities, and to stress again that significant benefits are derived therefrom. We firmly support the position taken by OCUA in the relevant advisory memoranda in 1975, 1976 and 1977 with respect to the eligibility of landed immigrants and urge the Minister to reconsider the eligibility of landed immigrants and to make every effort to extend the eligibility to all who hold landed immigrant status as of the annual closing date for applications.

We are pleased to support both the recommendation of OCUA and the Minister's decision concerning the special category of awards for visa students, and we are particularly pleased with the Minister's decision that holders of these awards will be exempted from the higher formula fee for visa students. We hope that the special category of awards for visa students

will be maintained and that current policy covering fees for holders of these awards continue.

4. Institutional Awards

These awards serve a particular purpose in supporting graduate activities at the smaller institutions; we therefore endorse the recommendation of OCUA and the decision of the Minister to continue this category of award for 1978-79. We also take note that OCUA will be reviewing their appropriateness in relation to the graduate programme planning process. In the spring of 1977, the report of the Chairman of the Selection Board to the Minister recommended the abolition of these awards. At that time OCGS wrote to the Assistant Deputy Minister urging that action be deferred until the universities receiving such awards had had an opportunity to discuss the matter with representatives of the Ministry. We repeat that request.

5. Eligibility Limit

The current regulations do not exclude the possibility of an Ontario Graduate Scholarship being awarded to an applicant who has already had support from NRC or other equivalent support for a period of four years and is thereby ineligible for con-

tinued support from that source into a fifth or subsequent year. We think this possibility should be excluded. The Chairman of the Selection Board has indicated his intention to make such a recommendation and we support the following: that an exclusion clause be introduced into the regulations to prevent the OGS awards being made to applicants who have already received four years of support from NRC, Canada Council, or other similar sources.

6. Operational Performance

Because of delays experienced this year in the initial distribution of application forms and materials, and in meeting subsequent requests for additional supplies, we also recommend: that the Ministry review its operation of the OGS programme and consider advancing its internal deadlines for planning, preparing, printing and distributing information and application materials and, also, that high priority be assigned to meeting requests for information and materials about the programme and to the distribution of the results of the competition.

SUMMARY

At the outset of this brief we noted our intention to respond to OCUA primarily in terms of Advisory Memorandum 77-VII. Consequently the major thrust of our remarks has been directed to the graduate planning process and funding in the context of OCUA's stated objectives and criteria. It was judged appropriate, however, to use the opportunity to address briefly some aspects of cooperative activities in the graduate area and to give you our response to certain questions raised earlier about graduate scholarships. Since system planning for graduate work in the Province has already a considerable history, we see this brief as forming part of the on-going dialogue and as following from previous submissions to OCUA.

May 25, 1978

APPENDIX I

THE CATEGORIZATION OF UNFUNDED GRADUATE PROGRAMMES

The following lists of unfunded graduate programmes have been assembled on the basis of the categories indicated in OCUA Advisory Memorandum 77-VII with some modification arising from a discussion by representatives of OCUA and COU on May 4, 1978.

Category 1 has been subdivided according to whether the funding requirements were completed prior to the date of the Minister's letter announcing the freeze (December 12, 1975) or prior to the imposition of the freeze (May 1, 1976).

Also, for category 1 it is suggested that the requirement of a reappraisal for those programmes which have not been appraised during the period March 1, 1973 to March 1, 1978 should be dropped. In support of this suggestion, it is noted that the appraisal of a doctoral programme subsequently leads to

a) the submission of a five-year report (from the date of implementation) to the Appraisals Committee and the possibility of a reappraisal if the Committee so decides

on the basis of the report,

b) a full scale ten-year reappraisal.

Also, although the five-year report and reappraisal are not automatic in the case of master's programmes, the Committee has the prerogative of calling for a report after 2, 3 or more years from the date of implementation and this has occurred in the large majority of cases (see programmes foot-noted 1).

For category 2, the lifting of the embargo as a requirement for funding was replaced by COU (planning) approval. The reason for this is that following the imposition of the freeze, COU discontinued the practice of requesting the removal of an embargo on completion of a planning assessment and ceased to forward requests for funding of individual programmes.

Category 2 has been further subdivided according to whether the appraisal was completed by the date of the Minister's letter to the executive heads (March 21, 1978) or had been initiated by that date. The argument in support of category 2b is that the time required to complete an appraisal is extremely variable with extensive delays frequently caused by factors that lie outside the

control of the institution, e.g. the difficulty of obtaining the services of suitable consultants. It does not seem appropriate to assign programmes into category 3 on the basis of such random factors.

Finally, there are seven programmes in category 2a and one in 2b which were recommended in the COU plan for graduate studies in physical education, kinesiology and related areas. The delay in lifting the embargo for this discipline was occasioned by the need for inter-Ministry discussions, and it seems reasonable on the basis of OCUA's recommendation in July, 1975 to move these programmes to category 1a or 1b as appropriate.

There is one proposal that falls outside these categories. It involves a joint, specialized PhD programme in economics at Carleton and Ottawa. Its development was encouraged by ACAP following the planning assessment of graduate studies in economics as a preferred alternative to having small separate programmes at both institutions. The joint programme will require appraisal but it should not be expected to meet the new funding criteria.

Footnotes

N.A. not applicable

1. The appraisal is older than the March 1, 1973 deadline.
2. This programme is funded (Minister's letter of May 12, 1975).
3. This programme is funded (Minister's letter of June 21, 1974).
4. The "programme" was really a new field added to an existing programme in health sciences. It came forward during interval between the imposition of the freeze and the adoption of the COU Policy Statement on the Implementation of New Graduate Programmes. It was implemented in the fall of 1976 and ACAP subsequently agreed that the University had acted properly within the conditions prevailing at the time.
5. The University has recently indicated its decision not to proceed with this programme.
6. This is the addition of a new field to an already existing programme.
7. COU agreed at its meeting April 3, 1975, that no new programmes in the mathematical sciences would be begun until the completion of the planning assessment.
8. The programme requires an appraisal before it can be reactivated (Recommendation 30 in the COU Report).
9. This programme is under review by ACAP in relation to the COU plan for economics and the COU plan for business.

10. Western has withdrawn its participation from the proposed joint programme. Windsor has indicated its intention to proceed on its own.

Category 1a

Any programme for which the former requirements for funding approval were completed before the Minister's letter announcing the freeze (December 12, 1975) and for which funding was not received during the period of formula suspension.

UNIVERSITY	PROGRAMME	APPRAISAL DATE (OCGS)	DATE OF COU APPROVAL	DATE EMBARGO LIFTED	IN A 3-YEAR PLAN	FOOTNOTE NUMBER
Brock	MEd Education	25/6/75	1/3/74	27/5/74	74-77	
Carleton	MA Religion	15/11/74	3/10/74	22/7/75	73-76	
Toronto	PhD Urban & Regional Plng.	15/12/72	3/10/74	22/7/75	75-78	1
Toronto	MA Religious Studies	19/9/75	3/10/74	22/7/75	76-78	
Toronto	PhD Religious Studies	19/9/75	3/10/74	22/7/75	76-78	
Toronto	MIR Industrial Relations	25/6/75	7/3/75	15/1/75	76-78	
Waterloo	PhD History	20/4/71	10/1/75	22/7/75	75-78	1
Waterloo	MA Recreation Studies	19/9/75	3/5/74	13/6/74	75-78	
Western	MA Journalism	18/10/74	3/12/73	19/12/73	75-78	
Western	MEd Education Studies	20/5/75	1/3/74	27/5/74	75-78	
Western	MA(T) Chemical Education	25/6/75	1/3/74	27/5/74	75-78	
Western	MA(T) French	25/6/75	1/3/74	27/5/74	75-78	
York	PhD Geography	20/4/71	3/12/73	19/3/74	74-77	2
York	MFA Theatre	16/11/73	3/5/74	13/6/74	74-77	3
York	MFA Visual Arts	16/11/73	3/5/74	13/6/74	74-77	3

Category 1b

Any programme for which the former requirements for funding approval were completed before the freeze was implemented (May 1, 1976) and for which funding was not received during the period of formula suspension.

UNIVERSITY	PROGRAMME	APPRAISAL DATE (OCGS)	DATE OF COU APPROVAL	DATE EMBARGO LIFTED	IN A 3-YEAR PLAN	FOOTNOTE NUMBER
Lakehead	MSc Forestry	23/4/76	5/12/75	N.A.	76-78	
York	MFA Film	16/1/76	3/5/74	13/6/74	74-77	
York	MFA Dance	16/1/76	3/5/74	13/6/74	74-77	

Category 2a

Any programme which had received COU (planning) approval, had appeared in the university's three-year plan, and been favourably appraised before March 21, 1978.

UNIVERSITY	PROGRAMME	APPRAISAL DATE (OCGS)	DATE OF COU APPROVAL	DATE EMBARGO LIFTED	IN A 3-YEAR PLAN	FOOTNOTE NUMBER
Guelph	MSc Human Kinetics	9/4/73	7/6/74	14/9/77	73-76	
Guelph	PhD Biophysics	21/2/75	12/6/75	P Embargo	73-76	
Lakehead	MA/Sc Physical Education	26/6/75	5/12/75	14/9/77	Approved 5 Yr.Plan	
Lakehead	MSc Geology	19/11/75	4/11/77	4/7/74	76-78	
McMaster	MSc Adapted Human Behav.	23/4/76	7/6/74	14/9/77	75-78	
McMaster	MA/Sc Teaching	19/11/76	1/3/74	27/5/74	76-78	
McMaster	PhD Nuclear Engineering	19/11/76	28/1/77	N.A.	76-78	
McMaster	MSc/PhD Behavioural Sci.	23/4/76		N.A.	75-76	4
Queen's	MA/Sc Physical Education	25/6/75	7/6/74	14/9/77	73-76	
Queen's	PhD Business Admin.	15/11/71	3/6/76	Embargoed	76-78	1
Queen's	MMus Music Education	20/5/77	17/9/76	P Embargo	76-78	
Queen's	MA Art History	17/6/77	17/2/78	P Embargo	76-78	
Toronto	MHSc Speech Pathology	18/6/76	17/2/78	N.A.	76-78	
Toronto	MHSc Community Health	18/11/77	17/2/78	N.A.	76-78	
Waterloo	PhD Kinesiology	16/1/76	7/6/74	14/9/77	76-78	
Waterloo	MSc Kinesiology	4/10/71	7/6/74	14/9/77	75-78	1
Waterloo	MSc Health Studies	18/6/76	17/2/78	N.A.	76-78	
Western	MClSc Family Medicine	17/6/77	17/2/78	N.A.	76-78	
Western	PhD Social Demography	17/6/77	16/12/77	19/9/74	76-78	
W. Laurier	MBA Business Admin.	15/11/74	3/6/76	Embargoed	74-77	

Category 2a

Any programme which had received COU (planning) approval, had appeared in the university's three-year plan, and been favourably appraised before March 21, 1978.

UNIVERSITY	PROGRAMME	APPRAISAL DATE (OCGS)	DATE OF COU APPROVAL	DATE EMBARGO LIFTED	IN A 3-YEAR PLAN	FOOTNOTE NUMBER
Windsor	MA Communication Studies	17/12/76	17/2/78	P Embargo	76-78	
York	MFA Musicology	17/6/77	17/9/76	P Embargo	76-78	
York	MA/Sc Physical Education	19/3/76	7/6/75	14/9/77	75-78	
York	PhD Admin. Studies	8/2/71	4/11/77	Embargoed	75-78	1

Category 2b

Any programme which had received COU (planning) approval, had appeared in the university's three-year plan, and been submitted for appraisal before March 21, 1978.

UNIVERSITY	PROGRAMME	DATE APPRAISAL BEGUN	DATE OF COU APPROVAL	DATE EMBARGO LIFTED	IN A 3-YEAR PLAN	FOOTNOTE NUMBER
Laurentian	MA Child & Devep. Studies	3/5/77	5/74	N.A.	76-78	
McMaster	PhD Business	10/8/77	4/12/77	Embargoed	76-78	
McMaster	MA Music Criticism	1/6/77	17/9/76	P Embargo	76-78	
Ottawa	PhD Electrical Engineering	14/2/78	7/6/74	22/7/75	N.A.	
Ottawa	MA Recreology	7/7/76	3/5/74	13/6/74	76-78	
Toronto	MHSc Clinical Biomed. Eng.	8/8/77	17/2/78	N.A.	76-78	
Toronto	MA/Sc Teaching	27/7/77	17/2/78	27/5/74	76-78	
Waterloo	PhD Physiological Optics	10/11/77	17/2/78	N.A.	76-78	
Western	PhD Physical Education	24/3/77	7/6/74	14/9/77	76-78	
Western	MA Symbolic Anthropology	24/3/77	3/5/74	13/6/74	76-78	
Western	MA History of Med. & Sci.	11/2/77	17/2/78	N.A.	76-78	
Western	MClSc Periodontics	12/7/77	17/2/78	N.A.	76-78	5
Windsor	MEd Special Education	17/3/77	17/2/78	27/5/74	76-78	6
Windsor	MFA Studio	6/6/77	17/2/78	P Embargo	76-78	
York	PhD Economics	7/12/77	4/12/77	12/12/73	76-78	
York	PhD Biogeography	19/4/77	16/12/77	19/3/74	76-78	6

Category 3

All other new and planned programmes.

UNIVERSITY	PROGRAMME	APPRAISAL DATE (OCGS)	DATE OF COU APPROVAL	DATE EMBARGO LIFTED	IN A 3-YEAR PLAN	FOOTNOTE NUMBER
Carleton	PhD Canadian Literature	20/5/77	Deferred	Embargoed	76-78	
Guelph	PhD Applied Statistics	Not Submitted	Deferred	COU Embargoed	76-78	7
McMaster	MA Art History	Not Submitted	Deferred	P Embargo	76-78	5
Ottawa	PhD Mechanical Engineering	Not Submitted	27/8/74	22/7/75	76-78	8
Toronto	MPP Public Policy	In Progress	Deferred	N.A.	76-78	9
Trent	MASc Psychology	23/4/76	Deferred	N.A.	76-78	
Waterloo	PhD Comparative Literature	18/4/75	Deferred	N.A.	76-78	
Western	DMus Music Education	Not Submitted	17/9/76	P Embargo	76-78	
Western	MA Art History & Criticism	Not Submitted	Deferred	P Embargo	76-78	
Wilfrid Laurier	DSW Social Work	In Progress	Deferred	N.A.	76-78	
York	PhD Linguistics/Stylistics	12/11/76	Deferred	Embargoed	76-78	6
Western/ Windsor	PhD Social Sci. of Sport	Not Submitted	Deferred	14/9/77	76-78	10

APPENDIX II

COLLABORATIVE GRADUATE PROGRAMMES

Collaborative graduate programmes are those programmes which emerge from collaboration or cooperation between two or more units, departments or groups. They may involve two or more departments in the same discipline or they may be interdisciplinary in character involving departments in different disciplines. The collective experience of the sponsoring groups provides the student with a broader base from which to explore what may be a novel interdisciplinary area or some special development in a particular discipline. Such programmes generally do not entail new departures or additional expenditures by the sponsoring groups but at the same time they permit the student to gain experience in an area which may enhance the breadth of his understanding and which may contribute to his employability upon completion of the programme.

A university may mount and announce a collaborative programme in an area only if the following conditions* are met.

1. All participating units, departments or groups shall have

both planning and appraisal approval for graduate programmes at the proposed level (master's or doctoral, as appropriate).

2. One department, at least, shall have both planning and appraisal approval to offer graduate training in the specified field or area or logical extensions of that field or area.

3. The other collaborating unit(s), department(s) or group(s) shall have planning and appraisal approval for fields (or programmes, where fields are not specified) which have clear relevance to the area of the collaborative programme.

4. The definition of the role of the participating units, departments, or groups shall be sufficiently definite to ensure that real rather than token participation occurs in the collaborative programmes.

5. Students shall register in one of the participating units, departments or groups and shall meet all of the

academic requirements of that establishment as well as any additional requirements of the collaborative programme.

6. The university shall have the agreement of both ACAP and the Appraisals Committee that in their judgment conditions 1 to 5 are satisfied before proceeding.

Programmes satisfying these criteria should not be regarded as "new" programmes and do not, therefore, require full-scale appraisal although planning approval will be necessary to limit undue duplication.

---

*The same conditions shall also apply to the mounting of collaborative programmes by two or more universities.

May 25, 1978